

**ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT**  
**February 3, 2026**

**I. GENERAL BUSINESS**

- A. Welcome and Roll Call:** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Alan Macdonald. The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Chair: Alan Macdonald

Commission Members: Michelle Schirmer, John MacKay, Greg Butterfield, Jeff Davis, Susan Whittenburg

Excused: Troy Slade

Staff: Ryan Robinson, Marla Fox, Jason Judd

Others: Sheryl Dame, Andrew Young, Craig Skidmore, Judy Jolly, Steve Burrows, Angelica Nash, John Nash, Constance Goeckeritz, Lacie Lawrence, James Lawrence, Bill McGee, Dean Barney

**B. Prayer/Opening Comments:** Susan Whittenburg

**C. Pledge of Allegiance:** Michelle Schirmer

**II. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

None

**III. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Public Hearing: Addition to Alpine City Development Code 3.34 Views Ordinance**

Ryan Robinson explained that with continued significant homes and accessory structures increasing in popularity within Alpine City, Councilmembers Young and Blackwell have proposed an ordinance that would create standards to limit any potential impacts on neighboring views.

The proposed Scenic Ridgeline, View, and Hillside Protection Ordinance establishes standards to protect Alpine City's significant mountain, ridgeline, hillside, and Utah Lake views by regulating building placement, height, grading, vegetation, and massing. The ordinance identifies specific protected scenic features and designated public vantage points, establishes objective criteria for evaluating visual and silhouette intrusion, and requires a visual impact analysis for applicable development proposals.

Additional standards address hillside development practices, vegetation management, and mitigation measures to balance scenic resource protection with reasonable use of private property.

Overall, the ordinance provides a comprehensive framework for scenic resource protection and reflects common goals seen in hillside and ridgeline regulations in Utah communities. The primary considerations for the Planning Commission are ensuring the standards remain objective, enforceable, and administratively feasible, while avoiding unintended constraints on reasonable property development or creating conflicts between neighboring property owners.

Ryan Robinson said in the General Plan it states we want to promote development designed to preserve the mountain and valley views and this would be adding a new code to reference.

Alan Macdonald asked if city staff drafted this ordinance and if the city Attorney had reviewed it for standards, enforcement, and findings. Ryan Robinson said staff did not draft this, it was presented to us by Council members Andrew Young and Sarah Blackwell. He said he spoke to the City Attorney to see if it would meet reasonable standards and be enforceable. The Attorney had questions about the enforceability of this.

Ryan Robinson said we need to look at standards such as house colors because he doesn't think cities can require houses to have a certain color unless it's in a neighborhood with an HOA.

Alan Macdonald opened the Public Hearing.

Bill McGee, Resident, said he helped write this ordinance. He said he's read a couple of dozen similar ordinances like this from other cities including Park City and Sedona Arizona. He said the focus is on documented observable conditions rather than opinion. This is based on fixed viewing locations, existing and proposed borders where ridgeline and skyline is interrupted, the degree of obstruction, and the visual dominance of the structure in relation to the landscape.

Mr. McGee said to support consistency, which includes a baseline of twenty percent, which is a fairly common standard used in other places. He said the applicant needs to demonstrate that if they've gone beyond that it's because the changes are unavoidable and minimized while still allowing reasonable use of the property. It's twenty percent of a visually meaningful change, not a minor one. It's high enough to avoid over scrutiny of small impact, but small enough to capture real harm.

Mr. McGee said most people come to Alpine because they love the view, they love the mountains; it is one of the values of living in Alpine. He said what they want to do is make sure that people who come here are not impacted by someone building some monolithic building next door that blocks their view and the value they derive by living in Alpine. He said we're not trying to guarantee views or stop development but avoid unnecessary and irreversible impacts when reasonable design alternatives exist. He said there are mechanisms in this to measure what impact there would be and what would be defined as a reasonable measure of response.

Jeff Gutfield, resident, asked how this would be enforced.

James Lawrence, resident, said he owns several parcels on Main Street. He said there is no consistency on Main Street, it is a complete hodge podge. He said when buildings were built here in the past, it has been the opinion of certain people at certain times. He said he doesn't see how you can put a standard on Main Street when every other building looks different going down Main Street, especially when you get to Main Street Court.

Mr. Lawrence said as far as the views are concerned, he one hundred percent agrees with that but said his issue is that the city has already allowed taller buildings to be built on Main Street and your view depends on where you are sitting how high the building can or cannot be and said it is subjective.

He said on building uses, we haven't had any clear, precise uses of what we can and can't do in the commercial area.

Mr. Lawrence said he has met with city staff but feels like it's not going anywhere. He said he's had a plan in with the city for three years, but no-one can tell him if it's approved because the city is working on the Main Street Plan. He said this was supposed to take three to six months and we are three years down the road. He has concerns about it because when he was reading through the verbiage it says to not let anyone tear down existing buildings but let them work with what's there. He asked about the house on Main Street that was torn down. Alan Macdonald said that it was a private residence that Mountainville Academy purchased and had torn down. He said there was some effort by some residents to try and buy it and preserve it as a historical building.

Mr. Lawrence said he has been waiting for the Main Street Plan to be finished so he can get an answer regarding what he wants to build. He would like consistency and for the city to work with the owners and not against them.

Ally G. said she respects that homeowners can build on their own property. She said she just wished homeowners would consider their neighbors when they build large buildings that block views.

Andrew Young, resident, said his grandfather came to Alpine because of the views. He said residents have asked him to do something about the views being blocked by development. He said the goal is to protect the mountain and valley views. How is this enforceable or doable?

Andrew Young said several cities have done this. He said they have protected scenic views which is different from neighbor to neighbor. He said these cities came up with vantage points where people would look to see if the vantage point is being obscured. He said this could be done at the planning stage. He said the developer would bring these vantage points forward and incorporate them into their plan.

Andrew Young said he's not sure what the solution is for neighbor to neighbor. He said we need to look at alternative designs.

Alan Macdonald said we have ordinances that require setbacks on the front, rear, sides, and have height restrictions of thirty-four feet. These ordinances are applicable to all and said he wanted to know if Mr. Young didn't think these ordinances were adequate. Mr. Young said the ordinance is not holding up and is not sufficient. He said the height of thirty-four feet is not working because people are bringing the grade up which makes the home taller. He said there is no rule for how tall a tree can be. House colors should blend in with the mountains.

Craig Skidmore, resident, said he had to hand it to the city for creating a hillside protection ordinance. He said he sees problems with this plan because of enforcement and neighbor to neighbor issues. He said there is potential to link it back to the hillside protection ordinance but needs more work.

Dean Barney, resident, said he used to have a beautiful view but over time, large homes and trees have blocked his view. He said his neighbor bought three lots and built a large gym and wanted to know how that got approved. He said this is an eyesore and wants an answer on how some of these buildings are getting approved.

Connie Goeckeritz, resident, said she has had a wonderful view and loves all her neighbors who have built regular homes. She said we have all looked out for our neighbors. She said she is not excited about an exotic car garage in the neighborhood. She said they are not homes, and she and her neighbors are broken hearted by what is being built behind her home. She said she appreciates the city looking into this and likes the idea of paint colors blending in with the mountains and not stark white. She is also upset about her expensive things removed from her husband's grave and would like it addressed.

John Nash, resident, said what is being proposed is needed. He said one day, the smaller homes will be torn down in the small part of town and large homes could be built where they were never intended. He said people move here for the views and if we continue to let this happen, it defeats the purpose. He said we need to preserve what we have, move slower and prevent big development.

Craig Skidmore asked if we could fine builders or homeowners or tear the building down. Alan Macdonald said we have a code Enforcer on staff.

Sheryl Dame, asked about lighting, she said there are a lot of really bright lights everywhere. She said the bright holiday lights are intrusive. She said the type and amount of lighting, especially on the hillsides, needs to be addressed.

Alan Macdonald said we have a fairly extensive light ordinance right down to the number of lumens you can use. It specifies how long you can run lights, how bright they can be, sport court lights, etc.

Alan Macdonald closed the Public Hearing.

Jeff Davis asked Ryan Robinson to provide insight into the Hillside Protection Plan.

Alan Macdonald said this proposal is based on Park City Municipal Code which regulates very specific vantage points which is sensitive land overlay. It only applies to these areas and does not apply to all of Park City. It is a very small area of Park City. It does not apply to their residential areas. He asked Ryan Robinson if Alpine City had anything similar. Ryan Robinson said we have a sensitive overlay and one small subdivision that has height restrictions.

Alan Macdonald said Park City's vantage points are ski base areas or turnout views. He asked if we have any identified viewpoints that we are trying to protect. He said in his mind he can't envision standing in our parks and having a development obstructing the views to any of the mountain views. Ryan Robinson said the developments coming in are small and he didn't see any obstruction to the views.

Jeff Davis said trees are getting taller. He said it depends on where you're at in the city and what your view is depending on what trees are obstructing that view.

Greg Butterfield said some of the developments are not in the city and we don't have any control over those areas in the County.

John MacKay said it was brought up that we would enforce this issue at application. He said there is an abundance of rights that come with land ownership. He said we have ordinances that balance the needs of owners. He said this ordinance goes beyond that balance and feels like city involvement would land us in trouble.

Alan Macdonald asked about a legal non-conforming lots or buildings. Ryan Robinson said existing homes, under this definition, are grandfathered in. There are problems when the home wants to expand, be removed or sold.

Alan Macdonald read an email from Greg Gordon stating hillside homes would need to trim trees, so they are not too tall or not plan tall trees going forward. He said designs are subjective and homes are being built that are within the code that are blocking views.

Jeff Davis said our height restriction is to protect views. He asked what the other reasons were for the height restriction. He said maybe it is for safety, fire reasons, infrastructure problems, Geotech, environment constraints, wind, snow, etc. He said thirty-four feet is pretty standard for a residential area.

Michelle Schirmer said vegetation is a hard one. She said we win some and lose some. If secondary structures are the issue, maybe there would be some way to work on those issues to preserve views for neighbors. She said sometimes the house is fine, but it's the large barn in the back, that's the problem.

Alan Macdonald said property owners have a right to have trees or a two-story house. If you have a one-story home and your neighbor comes in and builds a two-story home, you are going to lose more than twenty percent of your view. He said he is open to looking at an overly large horse arena, or similar buildings, but said this proposal is too broad and pit neighbor against neighbor.

Jeff Davis said we have staff that look at the code and apply it to each application. If it doesn't meet the ordinance, it can come before the Planning Commission for an exception. Alan Macdonald said we have reviewed many things and said no to some of them because they didn't meet the ordinance.

Susan Whittenburg said we have ordinances we try to follow and issues have come before us to review. She said it comes down to integrity, and some people don't care about their neighbor.

Greg Butterfield said this proposal needs more work because it is too broad. He said he is concerned about the private properties and the trees and would like to see this tabled so more work can be done on it.

John MacKay said he would recommend denial because there is too much work to be done and doesn't think it can be salvaged. He said this is not a solution. Jeff Davis said he agrees.

Michelle Schirmer asked what the timetable would be if we tabled this proposal. Ryan Robinson said if you want a quick turnaround, you need to be specific on what points you want addressed and made clear.

Ryan Robinson said we could look at height limits on accessory structures and where we measure the height from. Currently we measure from average grade, but you could change it to the natural grade.

Alan Macdonald said we love to see something come to us for those instances and examples that are difficult, but for ninety-nine percent, we have ordinances to mitigate the issues.

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member John Mackay moved to recommend Denial of the proposed Scenic Ridgeline, View, and Hillside Protection Ordinance (Alpine City Code 3.34), based on the following findings:

1. It imposes unreasonable limitations on a core property right, the *Right of Control* and of *Surface and Air Rights* which provide specific rights to build and landscape the land's surface and air above the land. These rights will be found to prevail in the first instance this ordinance was contested in litigation.
2. Alpine City has very few open spaces left to develop. The proposed ordinance would cause an unmanageable requirement to establish legal non-conforming properties. The vast majority of the city would fall into this category as to render the objectives of this ordinance mute.
3. Proposed ordinance would create disputes between neighbors placing the city in a position of adjudicating such disputes.
4. The proposed ordinance could prevent buildable lots from being developed rising to claims from property owners of having the city unfairly exercised eminent domain.
5. This ordinance attempts to legislate good taste, a concept that we have not attempted to do as a city. We are not an HOA, and we do not create CC&R's beyond basic ordinances.
6. This Ordinance would primarily be managed by complaint, leaving it to be unevenly enforced. Further it would introduce unintended future violations as landscaping matures.
7. No development is contemplated adjacent to the 12 public view corridors rendering the ordinance to be of little value.
8. The Sensitive Land Overlay already addresses concerns regarding silhouette and ridgeline.

Jeff Davis seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

**Ayes:**

Michelle Schirmer  
Greg Butterfield  
Alan Macdonald  
Jeff Davis  
John MacKay  
Susan Whittenburg

**Nays:**

**Excused**

Troy Slade

**B. Public Hearing: Review Draft of Main Street & Gateway Corridor Master Plan: Traffic Management Plan**

Planner Ryan Robinson explained that The Alpine City Main Street and Gateway Corridors Small Area Plan provide a long-term framework to guide land use, transportation, urban design, and redevelopment along Main Street and the City's primary gateway corridors. The plan focuses on improving traffic safety, multimodal mobility, and public spaces while preserving Alpine's smalltown character and supporting thoughtful economic development.

The Planning Commission has decided to break the plan into sections and provide comments/feedback instead of reviewing the entire plan at once. Another public hearing will be held once the chapters pertaining to the Planning Commission have been reviewed before a recommendation is made to the City Council. The section that will be reviewed at this time has to do with the Traffic Management portion of the document.

The Traffic Management Plan provides detailed, corridor-specific recommendations to manage vehicle traffic while improving safety and comfort for pedestrians and cyclists along Main Street and the City's three primary gateway corridors: Alpine Highway, Canyon Crest Road, and Westfield Road/200 North. Building on the City's Transportation Master Plan and Active Transportation Plan, the chapter emphasizes speed management, intersection safety, and multimodal connectivity through lane narrowing, restriping, enhanced crossings, curb extensions, medians, and roundabouts where appropriate.

Key recommendations include short- and long-term bicycle and pedestrian improvements, ADA upgrades, targeted intersection modifications, and traffic calming measures to support lower target speeds consistent with the City's desired land use and redevelopment patterns. Special attention is given to school-related congestion near Mountainville Academy and to coordination with UDOT on Alpine Highway improvements.

#### **GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE:**

- *Encourage and maintain a safe, convenient and inviting atmosphere for pedestrians within commercial areas by applying the Gateway Historic District Design Guidelines. (Policy 1.4 page 5)*
- *Preserve and beautify the three gateways into the City so that it is clear that you are entering Alpine. (Policy 1.5 page 5)*
- *Land zoned as B-C (Business Commercial) shall consist of professional office, retail and other commercial uses serving the community and situated within an environment which is safe and aesthetically pleasing. Limited residential shall be permitted as set forth in the Alpine City Development Code. (Policy 2.2 Page 7)*
- *Land zoned as TR-10,000 (Town Residential – 10,000 square foot minimum lot size) shall include the area generally located within the originally settled town center of Alpine that is considered appropriate for higher density residential development. (Policy 2.3 page 7)*
- *Land zoned as CR-20,000 (Country Residential – 20,000 square foot minimum lot size) shall include, but is not exclusive to, traditional agricultural land and land located at a lower elevation that is considered appropriate for medium density residential development. These areas should provide for the perpetuation of the rural and open space image of the City. (Policy 2.4 page 7)*

- *Land zoned as CR-40,000 (Country Residential – 40,000 square foot minimum lot size) shall include, but is not exclusive to, land generally located around the periphery of the City center considered appropriate for low density residential development. These areas should provide for the perpetuation of the rural and open space image of the City. (Policy 2.5 page 7)*
- *The Gateway Historic District Overlay Zone should maintain a high character of community development by regulating the exterior architecture characteristics of structures that are developed in the center of Alpine City (See Gateway Historic District Design Guidelines). (Policy 3.1 page 9)*
- *Promote safe and efficient traffic circulation by following the Street Master Plan. Pedestrian safety shall also be a key focus of the traffic circulation plan. (Policy 1.1 page 12)*
- *Promote the use of roundabouts or other traffic flow options to prevent the need for stop lights therefore maintaining the historic small-town rural atmosphere. (Policy 1.5 page 12)*
- *Seek to attract stable retail businesses that will stimulate economic growth and attract other likeminded businesses to the community. (Policy 1.2 page 28)*
- *Seek to attract new low-impact businesses that fit the character and scale of Alpine City. (Policy 1.3 page 28)*

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the proposed draft of the Main Street & Gateway Corridor Master Plan and provide any desired edits or feedback through a formal motion.

Staff anticipates incorporating the Planning Commission's comments and recommends tabling the item, if necessary, to allow time for staff and the consultant team to make revisions. If the Planning Commission determines that any requested changes are minor, the Commission may recommend approval of the plan to the City Council with those changes noted.

Alan Macdonald said the area's we are looking at are:

Main Street  
Alpine Highway  
Canyon Crest Road,  
Westfield Road  
2<sup>nd</sup> North

He said the area we are looking at on Main Street is by Mountainville Academy. He said there is a recommendation to prohibit left-hand turns. He said Alpine City has purchased the lot behind Alta Bank which could be used to help with school traffic.

Alan Macdonald talks about bike lanes, travel speeds, and the roundabout. He said the road south of the roundabout belongs to UDOT and we don't have much control over it. He said Canyon Crest Road has a couple of options with either creating a left-hand turn or convert the intersection to an always stop.

John Mackay asked about a roundabout by the school. Ryan Robinson said he didn't think that was happening. It would take part of the park and isn't feasible.

Susan Whittenburg asked about the school staggering start and end times or come up with a different drop-off and pick-up area.

Michelle Schirmer said Mountainville should solve their traffic issues, and it doesn't seem like they are doing anything about it. Alan Macdonald said because they want to add on to the school, it gives the city an opportunity to negotiate the traffic issues.

Jason Judd said there is a group that is meeting and trying to come up with solutions. Susan Whittenburg asked if the school is coming up with solutions because she is concerned that someone is going to get hurt there. Jason Judd said they are not, but they seem to be willing to come to the table because they want their addition. He said there is a study about putting the crosswalk that is at the bank to right in front of the school.

Greg Butterfield said a median might help because you can't go over a median. He said he doesn't like the double left-hand turn, but that forces people to turn right, make a U-turn, or go through the subdivisions. He did see where it states you can't park on the side of the road down by the fruit stand but suggested something similar for the school area. He said cars are parked on the street and doors are being opened with kids jumping out right next to the traffic. He said the school needs to help solve the problem.

Alan Macdonald said we have this plan that we need to make recommendations for and this is including all best efforts of Mountainville and the city to mitigate and or solve the Main Street traffic congestion issue.

Michelle Schirmer said speed calming measures are expensive. She said we should lower the speed limit on all of these streets to twenty-five miles per hour. She said we should work with UDOT to lower the speed on Alpine Highway; we work with the city to lower the speed limit on Main Street to twenty-five miles per hour, we work with the speed on Canyon Crest. She said we could post messages to the public to make them aware of the problems and then maybe we could put in some of these traffic calming measures.

Michelle Schirmer said the roundabout is going to happen on Canyon Crest. The city has purchased the property on the corner of Ridge Drive and Canyon Crest. She said she hopes the roundabout is small and that we lower the speed. She said she would like to target some of these traffic calming measures and prioritize them, so the money is used wisely.

Greg Butterfield asked why the cost of traffic calming measures can't be paid for by traffic tickets. He said it seemed like the Police Chief could be asked by staff to give tickets to speeders. Michelle Schirmer said the police say they don't have enough staff to give tickets because they're out doing more important things. Maybe more tickets could help pay for an extra officer.

The Planning Commission had a discussion about how to slow the speed in the city and how to get the word out.

C. **MOTION:** Planning Commission member Michelle Schirmer moved to Table the Main Street & Gateway Corridor Master Plan: Traffic Management Plan until a future meeting with these recommendations:

1. Reduce Main Street speed to 25 mph.
2. Temporary no left turn during school drop off and pick up.
3. Use temporary bollards instead of a permanent median for traffic safety.
4. No roundabout at 120 South.
5. Lower Canyon Crest to 30 mph before adding other traffic calming measures.
6. Prioritize Roundabout at Ridge Drive and Canyon Crest.
7. Work with UDOT to lower speed on Alpine Highway.

Jeff Davis seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u> Michelle Schirmer Greg Butterfield Alan Macdonald Jeff Davis John MacKay Susan Whittenburg	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u> Troy Slade
--	---------------------	--------------------------------------

**IV. COMMUNICATIONS**

The Planning Commission said the training video was very good.

**V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES:** January 20, 2026

**MOTION:** Planning Commissioner John Mackay moved to approve the minutes for January 6, 2026, as written.

Jeff Davis seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u> Michelle Schirmer Susan Whittenburg John MacKay Greg Butterfield Alan Macdonald Jeff Davis	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u> Troy Slade
--	---------------------	--------------------------------------

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member Susan Whittenburg moved to adjourn the meeting.

Greg Butterfield seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u> Michelle Schirmer Susan Whittenburg John MacKay Greg Butterfield Alan Macdonald Jeff Davis	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u> Troy Slade
--	---------------------	--------------------------------------

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.